

Free Elections in Cuba Urged

By Kenneth Dale

Staff Reporter

The Rev. Dr. Norman Howlett of All Souls' Church (Unitarian) proposed yesterday that President Kennedy take two steps in the Cuban crisis:

- Call for free elections in Cuba.

- Extend the Monroe Doctrine to the entire world.

"Let us declare boldly and explicitly," the minister said, "that if free elections are held in Cuba, and a People's Government established there, we shall give to (Cuba) all the economic aid she can use, all the technical assistance she requires, and all the defense against any aggressor a nation could ask."

The United States, he said, has "a debt of conscience" toward the Cuban people, for "American venality" brought about poverty and tyranny. By helping the Castro revolution, we sought to pay our debt, he said, but Castro proved false and failed to hold an election.

A free election, the minister said, would enable the Cubans, in the words of United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, to "recapture their own revolution."

While Russia moves to strengthen its foothold in the Western Hemisphere, the United States should reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine in a world-wide application, Dr. Howlett urged.

"Once more, let us declare," he said, "that we cannot view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing or controlling

in another nation in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition, not only toward our people, but toward the whole family of nations."

He noted that the United Nations was founded on this principle, and that "the nations of the earth" must apply it "together . . . for the benefit of all."

The minister pointed out the possible harmful consequences of unilateral action in Cuba, and said the greatest threat to the United States comes from those who propose this.

"We can stand the taunts of (Fidel) Castro," he said, "but can we stand the taunts of (Richard M.) Nixon, (Sen. Homer) Capehart, (Sen. Barry) Goldwater and (Mrs.) Luce? Will we be goaded into saying what we know it is unwise to say and doing what we never intended to do?"

Matter of Fact

By Joseph Alsop

The New Belligerence

INDIANAPOLIS—Our here in the old Midwestern heartland of American isolationism, the long pain and frequent frustrations of the old isolationism seem to have wrought an astonishing transformation. The old isolationism is seemingly being replaced by the new belligerence.



Alsop

That is the only conclusion you can draw at any rate from the fairly lurid results of two days of intensive door-to-door polling by Oliver Quayle of Louis Harris Associates and this reporter. The pattern was remarkably uniform, whether in the Republican, small town semi-suburbs of Columbus, Ind., or in Democratic, labor union neighborhoods here in Indianapolis.

Indiana is a good place to test Cold War responses, at the moment, for two reasons. Cuba is the central issue in the senatorial campaign here. And it is particularly interesting to see the isolationist heartland responding to a Senate campaign of this character.

The Republican candidate is the veteran Claghorn Sen. Homer Capehart, whose Korea-period turn about the wickedness of sending American boys to fight on foreign soil used to bring tears to every eye. Capehart now wants to send American boys to invade Cuba. And the old Capehart turn has been taken over by his Democratic opponent, young Birch Bayh.

This bizarre switch has hardly produced a debate on the Lincoln-Douglas level. There was almost no enthusiasm for either of the debaters among the 73 voters we talked with, many of them at considerable length, as is needful when political attitudes are being probed. Over 40 of our pollsters were not even clear which side of the debate Capehart and Bayh had respectively chosen.

BUT THE FACT of the debate—the constant headlines about Cuba, and the resulting neighborhood discussions—had focused attention on the issue itself, and had thereby caused most people to make up their minds about it. Among our pollsters, only seven persons, or less than 10 per cent, admitted they did not know what should be done about Cuba.

The rest had clear and frequently impassioned views on the subject. The old, peace-loving, inward-looking isolationist viewpoint was still represented, but by a surprisingly small minority. Only 16 men and women, or just a hair more than one-fifth of our total sample, did not favor any form of military action to humble Fidel Castro, because they "did not want a war."

In contrast, 24 of the people questioned, or about one-third of the total sample, positively favored going the whole hog, with an armed invasion of Cuba. They were not lightly belligerent either. Most of them, indeed, added some such comment as the explanation that they only favored invasion because "there was no other way left."

Finally, a slightly larger group of 27 persons said they were ready or even eager for more limited military action, in the form of a naval blockade of Cuba. These people plainly disliked the notion of a landing with its attendant loss of life. Most of them conceived the blockade as a way of avoiding the need for an invasion. A common comment was:

"It's the only way to prevent war" "war" meaning here the use of ground troops for a landing.

Such are the figures. In terms of Indiana politics, they mean that Sen. Capehart has been helped by the Cuban issue, at least among the Indiana voters who know which side he has taken. He has severe handicaps. Judging by our pollsters' most Indian

Capehart as a man; and there is a widespread feeling that he has fed too long at the public trough. But he seems likely to win re-election by a solid majority.

This, in itself, is a phenomenon worth weighing. Even a few months ago, no political observer in his senses would have imagined that any candidate of either party could meet with anything but disaster in Indiana by raising the cry of "send-the-boys-to fight."

A less impressive phenomenon, but also worth weighing, is the way opinions divided among the people Quayle and this reporter talked with. Ours, unavoidably, was a small opinion sample, and being small, it cannot be relied on for absolute accuracy. Yet the answers showed such a consistent pattern, and the group taking the traditional isolationist view was so reduced, that our small sounding has real significance.

OVER TWO-THIRDS of our pollsters were ready for military action of some sort. That was the most striking point. Also striking was the link between the line-up in our sounding and the line-up in the nationwide Gallup Poll on the same question. The inquiring doctor found a substantially smaller percentage than we did of those who favored armed invasion, and a comparable percentage of favoring blockade. Over-all, he got a majority, though a smaller majority, favoring action of some sort.

Most of the people polled by Gallup, of course, were in states where the election had not brought the Cuban issue to the fore. If isolationist Indiana responds to active agitation of the issue as our sample seems to indicate, one must conclude that the Gallup findings show only the beginning of the story. And the circumstances of the case insure the story's continuation.

New York Herald Tribune, Inc.
Copyright 1962